



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,049	12/28/2000	Xia Dai	042390.P10232	8997

7590

07/10/2003

John P. Ward  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

CHANG, YEAN HSI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2835

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/752,049

Applicant(s)

DAI, XIA

Examiner

Yean-Hsi Chang

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,9,11,12,15-18,20,21 and 23-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,9,11,12,15-18,20,21 and 23-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11, 15, 21 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochis et al. (US 5,825,617) in view of Gillespie et al. (US 6,393,573 B1).

Kochis teaches an electronic display screen comprising:

- A processor (344, fig. 18) (claims 1, 6, 21 and 25)
- The electronic display screen (301, fig. 13) to function as an electronic display screen when docked to a base (328, fig. 13) and to function as an information processing device when detached from the base (see 301, fig. 18) (claims 1, 11 and 21)
- Wherein the information processing device is a palm computer (see col. 6, lines 2-4) (claims 3 and 24)
- Wherein the base includes a notebook computer base (328, fig. 13) (claim 4)
- Wherein the base includes a memory (380, fig. 18) and a keyboard (360, fig. 18) (claim 5)

Art Unit: 2835

- A battery (36, fig. 1) being mounted on an edge of the display screen (claim 8)
- Wherein the electronic display screen can receive a point and press input and a scribble input (see col. 9, lines 9-10, and col. 11, lines 65-67) (claim 15)

Kochis fails to teach the electronic display screen comprising a suspend-to-RAM (STR) feature to dynamically transition the electronic display between a low power display mode when docked to the base and a higher power computer mode when detached from the base.

Gillespie teaches a STR feature (see col. 4, lines 65-67) which can turn a processor to be asleep for saving power.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Kochis with the STR feature taught by Gillespie for saving power.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochis et al. in view of Gillespie et al., further in view of Newman et al. (US 6,359,777 B1).

Kochis in view of Gillespie discloses the claimed invention except a battery being mounted on the back of the display screen for saving front area.

Newman teaches a mobile computer having a battery (12, fig. 2) mounted on back of a display screen (7, fig. 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Kochis modified by Gillespie with the battery taught by Newman for the purpose of front area savings.

4. Claims 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochis et al. in view of Gillespie et al., further in view of Lemke et al. (US 5,850,209).

Kochis in view of Gillespie discloses the claimed invention except that the electronic display screen can access base resources through a wireless link when the electronic display screen is detached from the base.

Lemke teaches a potable computer (10', fig. 5) having a wireless electronic display screen (38', fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Kochis modified by Gillespie with the electronic display screen taught by Lemke so that the electronic display screen can access the resources of the base through a wireless link.

5. Claims 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kochis et al. in view of Gillespie et al.

Kochis teaches a system comprising:

- A first information processing device (301, fig. 13) including a processor (344, fig. 18) (claims 16-17)

- A second information processing device (324, fig. 13) (claim 16)
- Wherein the first information processing device functions as an electronic display screen when docked to the second information processing device and functions as an information processing device when detached from the second information processing device (see 301, fig. 18) (claim 16)
- Wherein the second information processing device includes a notebook computer base (328, fig. 13) (claim 18)
- Wherein the information processing device is a palm computer (see col. 6, lines 2-4) (claim 20)

Kochis fails to teach the first information processing device comprising a suspend-to-RAM (STR) feature to dynamically transition the first information processing device between a low power display mode when docked to the second information processing device and a higher power computer mode when detached from the second information processing device.

Gillespie teaches a STR feature (see col. 4, lines 65-67) which can turn a processor to be asleep for saving power.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Kochis with the STR feature taught by Gillespie for saving power.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 16 and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

### ***Correspondence***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yean-Hsi Chang whose telephone number is (703) 306-5798. The examiner can normally be reached on 07:30-16:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on (703) 308-4815. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3431 for regular communications and for After Final communications. There are RightFAX numbers and provide the fax sender with an auto-reply fax verifying receipt by the USPTO: Before-Final (703-872-9318) and After-Final (703-872-9319).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-8558.

Yean-Hsi Chang  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit: 2835  
June 28, 2003

  
DARREN SCHUBERG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800